



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILED DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/317,349 10/04/94 CSULITS

E6M1/1106

STEPHEN G. RUDISILL
ARNOLD, WHITE & DURKEE
P.O. BOX 4433
HOUSTON, TX 77210

F CUMM: 115

TRAN. P EXAMINER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2606

DATE MAILED: 11/06/95

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

- ☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s) _____ days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-802. | 2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-940. |
| 3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1448. | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152. |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-51 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1-10, 22-32 and 50 are rejected.
5. ☒ Claims 11-21, 33-49 and 51 are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-940).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 118. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____, filed on _____.
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

Art Unit: 2606

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-7, 10, 22-28 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jones et al [U. S. Pat. No. 4,114,804] cited by Applicant.

As to claims 1 and 22:

Jones et al discloses a method and apparatus for authenticating documents, comprising:

- an ultraviolet light source for illuminating a document to be tested (Fig. 1c, it. 71; col. 5, lines 18-33);
- means for detecting light reflected by said document and generating an output signal responsive to the reflected light (Fig. 1c, it. 73; col. 5, lines 34-42 and col. 6, lines 38-48);

and

- means for determining the authenticity of said document based on the output signal (Fig. 3b; col. 6, line 38 - col. 8, line 35).

As to claims 2-5 and 23-26:

The presence or absence of the reflected light is detected at column 6, lines 38-48.

As to claims 6 and 27:

Art Unit: 2606

Jones et al teaches at column 6, lines 15-25 that the document is United States currency.

As to claims 7 and 28:

Jones et al teaches filter 74 for filtering the reflected light (see column 5, lines 34-42).

As to claim 10 and 32:

Jones et al teaches at column 5, lines 34-42 that the pass band of the filter is quite narrow, thus the filter is not sensitive to light having wavelength much longer than 450 nm which meets the claim limitation.

As to claim 50:

Jones et al further teaches means for selectively activating the device (col. 5, lines 3-17).

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same

Art Unit: 2606

person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

4. Claims 8-9 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Jones et al [U. S. Pat. No. 4,114,804] cited by Applicant and Cooper et al [U. S. Pat No. 3,618,765].

Jones et al discloses the claimed invention except for the filter which filters out light having wavelength longer than 400 nm. Cooper et al teaches that it is known to provide a filter for filtering out light having wavelength longer than 400 nm to a counterfeit currency detector as set forth at column 2, lines 4-9. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the filter as taught by Cooper et al in order to provide an ultraviolet light to the counterfeit currency detector as suggested by Cooper et al.

5. Claims 11-21, 33-49 and 51 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Gotaas discloses a device for checking genuineness of paper money utilizing a plurality of narrow wavelength bands.

Serial Number: 08/317,349

-5-

Art Unit: 2606

Hara et al discloses a bill discriminating apparatus which uses two color detectors for selectively and photoelectrically detecting light components reflected from a bill.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuoc Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-4861.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-8576.


P. Tran

October 30, 1995


LEO BOUDREAU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2600